

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

No new matter has been added by this amendment.

Claims 2-25 remain in the application.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over d'Appollonia et al. Applicant has cancelled claim 1 and amended claims 2-3 to dependent from amended independent claim 4, of which is indicated by the Examiner to be allowable if written into independent format.

Applicant contends that dependent claim 2 and 3 add further limitation to an allowable independent claim, claim 4. Thus, Applicant contends that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 by the Examiner has been overcome.

The Examiner has rejected claims 13-15 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over d'Appollonia et al in view of Graze, Jr. Applicant has amended independent claim 13 to include the limitation of "a plurality of diluent mass flow controllers (DMFCs) disposed fluidically upstream of said plurality of serially arranged diluters for monitoring the mass flow of dilution air being supplied to said plurality of serially arranged diluters, and at least one total mass flow controller (TMFC) disposed fluidically downstream of said plurality of serially arranged diluters for monitoring the mass flow of diluted air stream flowing through said plurality of serially arranged diluters" and contends that the addition of this limitation is not taught or suggested by the cited art making independent claim 13 allowable. Previously, claims 14 and 15 were amended to dependent from allowable claim 16 and add further limitation to an allowable claim. Independent claim 25 has been amended to include substantially the limitation of "a plurality of diluent mass flow controllers (DMFCs) disposed fluidically upstream of said plurality of serially arranged diluters for monitoring the mass flow of dilution air being supplied to said plurality of serially arranged

diluters, and at least one total mass flow controller (TMFC) disposed fluidically downstream of said plurality of serially arranged diluters for monitoring the mass flow of diluted air stream flowing through said plurality of serially arranged diluters" and contends that the addition of this limitation is not taught or suggested by the cited art making independent claim 25 allowable. Therefore, it is the Applicant's opinion that this distinct limitation and amendments overcome the Examiners objection of claims 13-15 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is in condition for allowance and allowance of the application at issue is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Byron G. Buck  
Registration No. 40,537  
Caterpillar Inc.

Telephone: (309) 675-6717  
Facsimile: (309) 675-1236

L6C